

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the following remarks is requested. Claims 1, 3, 15, 17, 37, 39, 51, and 53 have been amended. Claims 2, 8-14, 16, 21-23, 25, 28-36, 38, 40, 44-50, 52, 54, and 57-59 have been cancelled. Existing claims 1, 3-7, 15, 17-20, 24, 26-27, 37, 39, 41-43, 51, 53, and 55-56 remain in the application.

## ARGUMENT

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 15, 17-20, 24, 26-27, 31-33, 37, 39-40, 43, 51, and 53-56 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolf et al. (PGPUB 2003/0204399) (hereinafter Wolf).

Claims 31-33, 40, and 54 have been cancelled and the rejections thereto are thus moot.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of “determining vertices and arc parameters of the phoneme lattice for the input speech signal.” A similar limitation was recited in original claim 3. In rejecting that limitation, the Examiner asserted that this limitation is inherent in figures 3a and 3b with column 3, paragraphs 0033-0040 of Wolf. Applicant respectfully disagrees. This limitation was supported by the specification (see page 9, line 24 through page 10, line 10). Figures 3a and 3b simply show two example word lattices. It does not show, expressly or inherently, anything related to determining vertices and arc parameters of the phoneme lattice as supported by the specification. Additionally, Applicant would like to bring to

the Examiner's attention that Wolf only discloses a word lattice while the present application discloses a phoneme lattice. A phoneme lattice as disclosed in the specification (see e.g., page 8, line 3 through page 10, line 20) is different from and not equivalent to a word lattice as disclosed in Wolf. The basic elements, the ways of constructions, the parameters representing these two lattices are all different (see e.g., page 8, line 3 through page 10, line 20 of the specification of the present application and paragraphs 0033-0040 of Wolf).

Because Wolf does not disclose each and every limitation in independent claim 1, as currently amended, Wolf does not anticipate this amended claim. Independent claims 15, 24, 37, and 51, as amended, all include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. For reasons similar to those presented above, Wolf does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 15, 24, 37, and 51. Thus, these independent claims are not anticipated by Wolf either. Accordingly, all of the claims that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Wolf either. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 31, the Examiner asserted that column 3, paragraphs 0033-0040 of Wolf discloses all of the limitations recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Wolf at least does not disclose the client and server aspect of this claim. Particularly, Wolf does not disclose what workload (e.g., receiving an input speech signal and constructing a phoneme lattice for the received input speech signal) is performed by a client and what (e.g., searching the phoneme lattice) is performed by a server. Because Wolf does not disclose all of the elements recited in

this independent claim, this claim is not anticipated by Wolf. Accordingly, all of the claims that depend therefrom (i.e., claims 32-33) are not anticipated by Wolf either. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of claims 31-33 be withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Caims 5-6 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf in view of Van Thong.

Wolf is the sole reference which the Examiner asserted teaches all of the limitations recited in claims 5-6's parent independent claim 1 and all of the limitations recited in claims 41-42's parent independent claim 37. Based on the arguments presented above in traversing the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections of claims 1 and 37, Wolf does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 1 or 37. Van Thong was not cited to fix those deficiencies in Wolf. Thus, the combination of Wolf and Van Thong does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 5-6 and 41-42. These claims are patentable over Wolf in view Van Thong. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that that all active claims are presently in condition for allowance, and their passage to issuance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-1700. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2007

/Guojun Zhou/  
Guojun Zhou  
Registration No. 56,478  
INTEL CORPORATION  
MS JF3-147  
2111 NE 25<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Hillsboro, OR. 97124